## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI WESTERN DIVISION

)
)
)
)
) Case No. 4:19-cv-00332-SRB
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

## **ORDER**

Before the Court is Jorge Zea's Motion for Clarification and Declaratory Relief. (Doc. #1686.) Mr. Zea is not a party to this action, not a member of the Settlement Class, and not an intervenor. Mr. Zea requests "declaratory relief confirming that steering remains unlawful under both the Settlement Agreement and Section 1 of the Sherman Act," among other things. *Id.* at 6.

Mr. Zea does not have standing to seek relief in this action. Before properly filing a motion for substantive relief, Mr. Zea would need to successfully file a motion to intervene under Federal Rule of Procedure 24, which he has not done. *United States v. Metro. St. Louis Sewer Dist.*, 569 F.3d 829, 833 (8th Cir. 2009) (intervention required for non-parties to participate meaningfully in litigation). Furthermore, although Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 57 provides for a declaratory judgment action, Rule 57 does not—nor does any other provision of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—provide for a *motion* for declaratory judgment. *See I.E.C. ex rel. J.R. v. Minneapolis* 

Pub. Sch., SSD No. 1, 970 F. Supp. 2d 917, 925 (D. Minn. 2013). Thus, the motion must be denied

because "such a motion inconsistent with the Federal Rules." *Id.* Finally, to the extent the Motion

is considered an objection to the Settlement, Mr. Zea does not claim to have sold a home on an

MLS and paid a commission during the eligible time period, so he has not established that he is a

member of the Settlement Class. Non-class members lack standing to object to class settlements.

For the reasons stated above, Jorge Zea's Motion for Clarification and Declaratory Relief

(Doc. #1686) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Stephen R. Bough

STEPHEN R. BOUGH, JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Dated: April 22, 2025